



Dr. Conrad Festa
Executive Director

June 30, 2004

Memorandum

To: Members, Advisory Committee on Information Resources (ACIR)
From: Camille T. Brown, Program Manager of MIS
Subject: Meeting

An ACIR meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 7, 2004, at **10:00 A.M.** in the large conference room of the Commission on Higher Education.

Please find attached the agenda for this meeting, and the minutes from the meeting on July 7, 2003. We look forward to having you join us.

AGENDA

Advisory Committee on Information Resources
July 7, 2004
Commission on Higher Education
Large Conference Room
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
10:00 A.M.

- I. Introductions
- II. Review and acceptance of minutes
- III. E-Learning for SREB
 - a. Data Currently Reported
 - b. Discussion of Requested Information
- IV. Student Scholarships and Grants
 - a. Excellent Enhancement Program - Pell Grants
 - b. Cost of Attendance
 - c. Expected Family Contributions
- V. Student Enrollment
 - a. Universal Grading Scale – Universal Grading Scale Rank
 - b. LIFE GPA and Hours
 - c. Additional data field for SAT Writing
- VI. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
 - a. Schedule for Reporting
 - b. Enrollment
 - c. Graduation Rates
 - d. Completions
 - e. Salaries
- VII. Data Reporting
 - a. Schedule for 2004-2005 for CHEMIS data
- VIII. Other Business

Advisory Committee on Information Resources
July 10, 2003
10:30 a.m.

Members Present

Ms. Mim Armour
Ms. Betty Boatwright
Mr. Russ Bumba
Ms. Kay Coleman
Ms. Nancy Floyd
Ms. Linda Graham
Ms. Jodi Herrin
Mr. Eric Johnson
Mr. Mac Kirkpatrick
Dr. Carol Lancaster
Ms. Shelly Lang
Ms. Eileen Mansfield
Ms. Chris Mee
Ms. Sandra Morris
Dr. James Myers
Mr. Charles Parker
Ms. Geri Shuler
Ms. Michelle Smith
Ms. Yvette Alston Smith
Ms. Gail Stevens
Mr. Bob Stickland
Mr. Jonathan Trail
Ms. Catherine Watt
Ms. Sannie Wright

CHE Members Present

Ms. Camille Brown
Mr. Charlie FitzSimons
Ms. Bichevia Green
Ms. Sherry Hubbard
Mr. Rao Korrapati
Ms. Julie Wahl
Ms. Stephanie Weeks
Dr. Karen Woodfaulk

The Advisory Committee on Information Resources (ACIR) met in the conference room of the Commission on Higher Education on July 10, 2003 at 10:30 a.m. Ms. Brown called the meeting to order. One correction was made to the minutes from July 8, 2002 correcting Leroy Rooka to Leroy Rooker. Ms. Brown asked all the members present to introduce themselves.

The first topic of discussion was regarding student enrollment and the inception of scholarship programs dealing with students studying abroad. Private institutions, more so than public institutions, that have students abroad receiving scholarships were not being reported as being enrolled at the home institution. In the handouts were included IPEDS notes and the requirements regarding students to be excluded, "students studying abroad if their enrollment at this institution is only an administrative record and their fee is nominal". CHE does not consider scholarship programs to be nominal, so those students should be reported in the enrollment data. The next issue, students that are enrolled but attend another institution, should be reported as enrolled at the home institution. The institutions agreed that they would report this way.

Next, the Uniform Grading Scale was discussed. Included in the hand outs were the CHEMIS definition of High School GPA, South Carolina State Department of Education's Grading Scale Policy and frequently asked questions regarding the Uniform Grading Scale. Ms. Brown stated that eligibility for all state scholarships beginning fall 2004, would be based on uniform grading scale. Ms. Green then stated that all high schools have been asked to convert all their grading scales to the uniform grading scale based on the uniform grading scale set up by the State Department of Education. Ms. Green emphasized that it was very important that the schools base their scale on the Carnegie units and not on the individual schools policies and procedures. The high schools have also been asked in regards to scholarships to state on the transcripts if the 3.0 is based on uniformed grading scaled and the class rank should be included on the transcript. Private high schools have been given the option to create a different form for scholarship purposes using the uniform grading policy for the scholarships while maintaining their current policies and procedures on grading. Therefore, from private high schools two GPAs – a high school GPA and a uniform grading scale GPA may be reported. The Commission sent out a directive to the colleges and high schools in April so they would know what to expect on the transcripts. Question arose as to whether this new scale would take the place of the weighted scaled being currently used. For Palmetto Fellows and LIFE it will definitely change – they will be using the uniform grading scale. When CHE looks at the GPA for Performance Funding they look at high school GPA, rank in class and SAT. The problem occurs because you are not just looking at SC students. There are just a few schools that use really unusual scales although there are the exceptions that use that 6 point scale with the weighted scale. The question was posed if there was a mechanism to be sure that schools were sending the real GPAs and not overwriting them with the UGS GPA. Ms. Green stated that the only test is to use the material given by the State Department of Education to check the transcripts for consistency.

The Performance Funding indicator looks at first time freshmen and their credentials and it says they are on a 4.0 scale and all the GPAs being reported right now are being converted. But with the Uniform Grading Scale you can exceed 4.0.

At this point there was a discussion among everyone as to whether to capture both GPAs. It was decided to make the decision after the institutions had a chance to go back and talk with the admissions people at their institution. A Semi-annual ACIR meeting was proposed to finalize this decision to capture both.

Our next topic of discussion was in regards to Speede Express. The Commission gets about 200 appeals for LIFE scholarships and about 50 for Palmetto Fellows. The Commission is interested in getting this software so that the institutions can send their official transcripts for LIFE scholarships and Palmetto Fellows scholarship appeals. The format that Speede/Express uses is a standard format. There are different data fields within the standard format, but there are sections for the grades and the courses. The type of data stays consistent within the sections. This will be of great benefit for the student but also will benefit CHE. CHE will not be able to integrate it with their system this year but will be able to do so next year. The benefits for the students, will be that the student

won't have to request the transcript and the time that it takes for CHE to receive the transcript will be less. The question was asked if some of the documentation is coming in by mail, how would receiving the transcripts by Speede/Express be beneficial to the students, if that documentation still needs to be matched up? Ms. Brown answered that initially it may not be, but once the system was integrated a process could be developed to handle this. It was also mentioned that there was other software that may allow for receiving and acknowledging the transcripts automatically. There were about 6 institutions present at this meeting that could presently electronically transmit transcripts. It was agreed that CHE would work towards getting an electronic transcript receiving process available for those institutions that were able to access it.

Ms. Brown proceeded to discuss the spreadsheet included in the handout that is used by Ms. Hubbard for Palmetto Fellows to renew their scholarship. Ms. Hubbard sends the institutions this Excel form with the Palmetto Fellows that we have and requests specific information and then requests that the institution return the form to CHE. Because of timing issues, it was determined that the best thing to do at this point was to download this data into a database and report it that way versus trying to report it in with the enrollment record or through Speede/Express and the institutions will begin the new process of reporting it in a database next summer.

The next topic discussed was the 2000 CIP codes. Ms. Brown went through the attachments reviewing highlights of the inventory crosswalk between the 1990 CIP codes and the 2000 CIP codes. The Excel spreadsheet with the inventory crosswalk is posted on the CHEMIS Technical documentation page. If there is any trouble accessing this form, please contact either Ms. Brown or Ms. Weeks requesting the spreadsheet via email, cbrown@che.sc.gov or swEEKs@che.sc.gov.

In the process of implementing the new program codes, academic affairs requested that we change the secondary education codes to better identify the concentrations. Ms. Brown in working with the institutions has made this change be adding suffixes for each secondary education inventory code that needed to be identified by concentration.

There was also a request to break out the BSN nursing codes into two categories, BSN generic and BSN completers. Previously the institutions were surveyed for this information. However by using the suffixes in the handout to identify between the two when reporting individual students, the need for the survey will be eliminated.

All CIP codes in the CHE inventory will be converted to the new 2000 CIP codes – even historical codes, between August 15th and August 30th. CHE will be accepting both the old codes and the new codes. The institutions have to let CHE know which set of codes are being used. However, if the institution chooses to send old codes, CHE is going to convert them to the new codes and if there are errors in the data, the edit report will have error messages with the new codes.

The next topic was regarding not submitting Free Credit hours separately. Ms. Brown proposed to the group submitting the Free Credit hours with the course data. After much discussion it was agreed to not change the procedure at this time.

Ms. Brown's then discussed the institutions participation in Student Loan Clearinghouses. Several states are getting clearinghouse data. The technical colleges are requesting it individually. Ms. Brown proposed trying to submit the data at state level. She thought it would be good to get to try to get a package deal pricing for technical colleges and regional campuses.

Included in the handouts was an updated schedule for CHEMIS reporting dates for Fall and Spring. This was briefly reviewed. The Summer dates will be updated in the fall after the current summer dates have expired.

Ms. Brown briefly reviewed the disbursement process to be sure that everyone understands how it works. In August CHE's Internal Operations sends out correspondence requesting the amount of scholarship dollars an institution needs. The money is then disbursed. The institutions send the awardees' data in October to CHE. The difference between the requested amount in August and the actual disbursement amount reported in October creates an over/under for the institution. This amount is listed as an adjustment when CHE's Internal Operations sends out the request again in December for spring. CHE then disburses money for spring and the institutions again send their awardees' data. The difference between the awardees' data and the actual disbursed amount is then corrected during the reconciliation period. The differences found during reconciliation process are then adjusted in the August request made by the institutions.

Included in the handout was a copy of the legislation that was passed on Pell Grants. Based on fall enrollment and the number of Pell Grant recipients (60% or more of the undergraduate population), a four year institution is eligible for lottery money starting fall 2003. There will be \$ 3 million split among all institutions eligible to participate. CHE requested that the institutions report their Pell recipients to us either by survey or by a field in their disbursement report. A yes or no field would be sufficient. However, due to the number of requests that CHE receives from the legislature and the public, the amount awarded to each student would be preferable. The institutions agreed to report their Pell recipients on their disbursement report.

SAT/ACT conversion. Ms. Brown asked the institutions, "how are you converting your SAT scores? Are you using the prescribed tables from ECS?" The majority said yes. It was decided that if a student has ACT and SAT that the institution uses the table to convert the ACT for a comparison but then give CHE which ever score is higher. CHE is to received the actual ACT score, not the converted score.

CHE ha plans to upload the GRS data for the institutions. One question that was raised is can CHE identify the athletes? The institutions agreed they would prefer to continue the athletic reporting, at least for this year.

Mr. FitzSimons gave us the final topic on Lottery Technology Grants. There will be \$12 million available for disbursement. Fifty percent of that will go to the 4 year institutions which will be based on a 65% FTE enrollment split to 35% for all eligible. The other fifty percent will go to the two year institutions and it will be allocated based on headcount. The cash for this grant will not be available until after October 15th.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.